A Discussion of the Questions Relating to the Passover and Lord's Supper.

BY T. C. EARLY AND L. A. TIME.

PROPOSITIONS.—1. The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ. 2. The Bible teaches that Christ ate his last supper with his Disciples before the hour or day appointed by the law of Moses for observing the legal Jewish Passover, and expired on the Cross on the day and hour fixed for the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb. 3. The Legal *Jewish* Passover, modified by Jesus Christ is the proper Lord's Supper for the Christian Church.

PROPOSITION FIRST.—*The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ.* T. C. Early affirms; L. A. Time denies.

In the opening of this discussion I feel like making a few remarks by way of introduction. I do not enter into this discussion for any fondness for controversy that might be supposed to be in me. So far as it relates to that, I would rather leave it for somebody else; neither do I go into this discussion on account of any unfriendly feelings toward each other, for we only know each other as friends, and hope to retain that friendship during our discussion. Our only purpose is to place our views on these topics before the readers of the EVANGELIST for their candid and impartial consideration, and to come to a clear understanding of the points under discussion, hoping that our readers will make due allowance for our failings and mistakes.

I will now try to direct your attention to the first proposition as stated above. Upon the truth embodied in this proposition, if sustained by the Bible, depends, in a great measure, a true conception of the purpose of God and the means of grace, according to "His eternal purpose, in the redemption of man."

By the law of Moses God commands the Israelites to sacrifice a lamb or kid, and sprinkle the lintels and sideposts of their doors, that the destroyer would pass over them and not hurt them. This lamb they were commanded to eat, and it was called the Lord's Passover. (Ex. 12:—). Now the word *Paschal* has reference to this sacrifice, and I need not define it any more definitely, as it is understood. And the meaning of *type*, as applied to Scripture, and according to common acceptation, is a pattern, an example or similitude of a person or event, whether there is a close resemblance in the external appearance or not. Paul says, the law was a shadow of good things to come. Heb. 10:1. Peter, referring to the ark of Noah, says, "according to the type of which we are now saved by baptism." 1 Peter 3:21. (McNight). In this use of types and figures we affirm that the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ, though there was no similarity in the external form or appearance, but there was a striking similarity in the use and purposes of the sacrifices to that of Jesus Christ. And if the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, under the law of Moses, had its counterpart in the sacrifice or crucifixion of Christ, and the apostles so represent it, then, truly, the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ. Now we ask, do the apostles and prophets so represent it? Paul says, "For even Christ our passover, has been sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5:7. This alone would be sufficient to prove that Christ is represented as the antitype of the Paschal lamb. The apostle Peter likewise represents Christ as the antitype of the Paschal Lamb by saying, "Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Peter 1:19. This is too plain to be mistaken. St. John says: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29. Again, "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." Isaiah 33:7 and Acts 8:32. "Worthy is the lamb that was slain." Rev. 5:12. "That the Scripture should be fulfilled, a bone of Him shall not be broken." This proves positively that John, in his gospel, used this with reference to the Paschal Lamb, and what a remarkable fulfilling of prophecy here, remembering that when the Roman soldiers went out to break the legs of the malefactors and of Christ, but finding Christ already dead, they did not break his legs, and corresponding exactly with the Mosaic law on the Paschal Lamb, where it was commanded that not a bone should be broken. Num. 9:12. Having now fairly stated my claims with the proof on which they rest, I will await a reply.

REPLY.

We accord with our brother in saying that the purpose of these articles is to arrive at a better understanding of the truth. We indeed both believe in a festival Lord's Supper, but we differ in found ing the doctrine for this holy practice; and the propositions we propose to examine together in brotherly love, will, I trust, lead us to a better understanding of the subject.

I deny that the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ. I so speak of it here in the direct sense, and in this sense it is so considered by the many theologians who have written upon the subject.

In considering this class of types, the following principle should be the guide:

A TYPE IS A TYPICAL PROPHECY OF THE ANTITYPE, WHICH IN TURN CONTAINS THE HISTORY OF THE TYPE.

In the Passover lamb of the Bible there is no typical propheey of Christ. Moses is the type of Christ we find in the passover. There is harmony between the history of Moses in his relation to the passover and the children of God, and Christ and the Lord's supper and the redeemed. Moses declares that he was a type of Christ in these words: "The Lord your God will raise up a prophet like unto me."

There is no similarity between the history of the passover lamb and the history of Christ, and the last quotations made by the brother relate to Christ as a sacrifice for sin. In that respect the lamb in the Mosaic sacrifice was a type of Christ. But the passover lamb was not offered as a sin-offering; consequently there is no relation between the lamb of the sin-offering and the lamb of the passover.

The fact that no bone of Christ was broken was a fulfilling of prophecy, and an evidence that he was the Messiah as predicted, and God's son. His cloak was not divided either. If Christ was the antitype, there must be a corresponding history. What does the ten days keeping up mean? What does the roasting mean? Who represents the destroying angel?

Again, why did not Christ take lamb's flesh in the Lord's Supper and bless it; and say, "this is my body," if the lamb was the type, or represented Christ? If the paschal lamb was a type of Christ, our brother and the whole line of theologians who have followed the Alexandrian school must show why lamb's flesh is not now the proper element to represent the body of Christ in the Holy Supper. Such a conclusion is logical, sensible and appropriate.

Christ, as a lamb, in the New Testament is spoken of as a sin-offering or as an atonement for sin, and not as a part of a commemorative festival.

The Simplicity of the Way of Salvation.

The way of everlasting life which is revealed through the Gospel is clear and simple. The prophet Isaiah, when he foretold of the excellent way, declared how that there should be a way, and it should be called the way of holiness. The unclean should not walk over it, but it shall be for those, the redeemed and ransomed of the Lord. The wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein. Isaiah 35:8. No unclern thing shall pass over this way. Naaman, the Syrian, who was a leper, when he heard of Elijah, the man of God, who was in Samaria, came with his horses and chariots and stood at the door of the house of Elijah. The prophet did not even come out to see him, but sent a messenger saying, "Go wash in Jordan seven times and be clean." Naaman went away in a rage because the prophet did not come out and wave his hand over the place and recover the leper. 2 Kings 5:9. This humble act was too simple for this mighty man of valor. His proud, fleshly mind would not allow him to condescend to go down into the waters of Jordan to wash and be clean. Naaman wished to substitute the rivers of Damascus for the Jordan, preferring his own way to that of the man of God.

This wonderful event is a beautiful similitude of the way many would come to Christ. They who set aside the divinely appointed and established ordinances of his earthly sanctuary and substitute human inventions. Again, in the narrative of Naaman there is a true likeness of how and when we meet with God's approval. You will observe from the scripture narrative, 2 Kings 5:1, 9, that it was not till after Naaman had been obedient, having washed, that the prophet came out to him. It is precisely the same in the Christian dispensation. The promise of God reads thus: "Repent ye and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The spirit of grace which comes from above is never given until the letter of the word is obeyed. The outward and visible act must be performed before the inward and invisible gift is given.

Dear reader, the one thing needful is prompt and unquestionable obedience to God's commands. When Jesus spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man and said unto him, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam," John 9:7, the blind man did not hesitate one moment. He did not question the ability of Christ to restore to him his sight. He did not make any inquiries about the strangeness of the Savior's act in anointing his eyes with clay. He did not raise any objection, although he knew not Christ at this time, but he was prompt to go and wash and came back seeing. Lo! in like manner, those who are spiritually blind and who are dead in tresspasses and sin, whose minds are darkened by the craft and devices of Satan, in order that they might see with their mind's eye, (not men as trees walking) but see clearly the things that are afar off, must promptly adhere to the means of grace which God has provided. The cure is sure and effectual; the mind will become enlightened by the light of life, and being quickened together with Christ, will be no longer dead, but will be able to exclaim as one of old: "This my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found." Luke 15:24. There is another feature in this wonderful event. As soon as the blind man's sight was restored he began to publish it abroad, confounding the Pharisees and the Jews until they cast him out of their synagogue.

Dear Christian brethren, are we publishing abroad what Christ has done for us, or have we received his Spirit in vain? Do we ask all that we come in contact with, "will ye also become His disciples" and walk in the way of holiness with all the ransomed and redeemed?

THOMAS GIBSON.

Lathrop, Cal.

Church members who are disposed to neglect their own pastor, depreciate his labors, and run after every evangelist that comes along, will do well to read and ponder the following from the *Western Christian Advocate*. It contains some wholesome truths worth remembering. It says:

"Sometimes the evangelist is a jester, and the people roar with laughter. He has a stock of sermons and illustrations which he repeats o'er and o'er; he has expedients which he employs in the same way; he tells stories of his amazing success at other places, for being an evangelist, he visits many places. These things 'draw,' and the pastors, because they are pastors, and abide for months and years, have none of these expedients for securing crowds. Seeing the multitudes, some of the influential people of the church say: 'See how this man draws? Oh, if our minister were only like this man!' And they are convinced that a stranger must come before much can be accomplished; and thus many of the people who rally to the help of the evangelist leave their own minister to toil alone, or, in despair, not to toil at all."—SEL.

Christ in us, that we may never despair when we are beset by difficulties; we in him, that when we have attained someting we may reach forward to greater victories.—Canon Westcott.

The gospel of Christ incarnate, the gospel of the Holy Trinity, is new now as it has been in all the past—as it will be new, new in its power and new in its meaning while the world lasts.—Ibid.

A minister who hopes to do good with stolen sermons will no more be a successful embassador to men than a foreign minister at the court of St. James with the credentials he stole from the archives of those illustrious ex-ministers, James Buchanan or Benjamin Franklin.—Talmage.